

TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Summary of Written and Verbal Comments Received

Plan Chapter/Topic	Name/Date/Medium	Comment
Chapter 1		
Chapter 1	William (Bill) Neil PH 022107	The Twinbrook Plan referenced the 95,000 housing units that Montgomery County was going to be short, over the projected 20 years. How many of the Montgomery total do you plan to build? I'm not opposed to mixed use but I need to know how many units and how to reduce the number of auto trips. We still don't have a number.
Chapter 1	Todd Harrison Chair T&T TCA PH 101007	Speaking for myself. The plan notes that 60% of students at Twinbrook ES are on free, or reduced priced lunch. Yet the plan doesn't say anything about what we can do to help. Extra after school programs is a start. Affordable housing is a start Maybe we can have a trade off deal where you build another floor higher you have to increase the percentage of MPDUs. There are trade offs like that for environmental considerations.
Chapter 3 Housing		
Chapter 3 Housing	Todd Harrison, T&T Chair, TCA. PH 022107	We are a modest neighborhood, and it's a characteristic we want to preserve. The Plan vision statement and the plan doesn't preserve that: it says Twinbrook should become more dense and it should transform. I think that's contrary to the wishes of the neighborhood. The vision says nothing about affordable housing.
Chapter 3 Housing	Rich Gottfried PH 022107	Eliminate the opportunity for townhouse RTH overlay zones to stop single-family homes being replaced by townhouses.
Chapter 3 Housing	Judy Miller, Vice President TCA, TNPAG member PH 022107	Concerns about conservation districts. Don't want them to interfere with the improvement of our neighborhood. RORZOR is looking at the percentage for a conservation district. There may a 30% figure. Housing should be more family friendly, some three-bedroom apartments and town houses.
Chapter 3 Housing	Robert Ostlund, TNPAG member PH 022107	As a homeowner with a vested interest in Twinbrook want to ensure that whatever was happening wouldn't have an adverse effect upon me. Bothered by the reduction in the rights of individuals to improve their homes.

TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Summary of Written and Verbal Comments Received

Plan Chapter/Topic	Name/Date/Medium	Comment
Chapter 3 Housing	Brigitta Mullican PH 101007	Don't want conservation districts. The issues are traffic, safety. The plan has two percent commercial and ninety eight percent residential. And I think we need to talk more about the residential.
Chapter 3 Housing	Linda Bozzonetti TNPAG member PH 111407	We voted as a group to retain the neighborhood zoning and character. Residents of Twinbrook need to made improvements to their homes. The houses were designed to be added on to – they're Levittown-type homes. Some of the additions have been done very well and we want to encourage that. Several years ago The Washington Post featured Twinbrook in the "Where We Live" column. It was called the last affordable neighborhood in Montgomery County.
Chapter 3 Housing	Karl Harger PH 111407	It's encouraging that the stick framing built almost 70 years ago is still used as homes are enlarged. But how massive can they be? I wouldn't want to live next door to somebody whose vinyl siding is extending 20 feet in the air above my bedroom window.
Chapter 3 Housing	William A Ormsby Written	Like to see the single-family homes remain so and not facilitate their use for multiple families.
Chapter 3 Housing	Carol Hannaford Written	Believe "single-family living in single-family housing" is dwindling everywhere. Twinbrook is simply a microcosm of that trend. We need to welcome all residents. The emphasis should be on the behavior of the residents, not their demographic characteristics.
Chapter 3 Housing	Christina Ginsberg TCA Written	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All references to floating or overlay zones (except historic designations) should be deleted. • All references to Neighborhood Conservation Districts should be removed. • Review zoning for churches, etc. in the TNP area. • All future development applications for housing should favor owner-occupied family-friendly housing. • Review zoning for churches etc. in the TNP area.

TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Summary of Written and Verbal Comments Received

Plan Chapter/Topic	Name/Date/Medium	Comment
Chapter 3 Housing	Henrietta V. Gomez, Michael R. Schneible Written comment	Do not agree with recommendation that land zoned for churches and schools, if redeveloped, be retained for single-family homes. A better use would be for recreation and/or park. We purchased a home here because we like the neighborhood. If homeowners add second stories where there were none, or build large additions, the character of the neighborhood will change. Recommend that additions not exceed 120% of the square feet of the average house of the current streets, plus the present setbacks and maximums would allow for additions but keep the character of the neighborhoods.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Veirs Mill Road		
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Veirs Mill Road	Todd Harrison, T&T Chair, TCA. PH 022107	Strongly oppose the proposal to rezone the shopping centers for a multi-use development.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Veirs Mill Road	Rich Gottfried PH 022107	Object to defining mixed use as retail on the bottom and condos on top. Suggest the three Twinbrook shopping areas be defined and zoned as retail use only. Shopping centers should be improved, upgraded and a plaza mall defined as its zone. More condos and townhouses would deteriorate the neighborhood and increase traffic. Do not allow a mixed-use neighborhood center zone, or a floating zone.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Veirs Mill Road	Harry Thomas, former President, TCA PH 022107	It needs mixed use. We're going to have the same eyesore on Veirs Mill Road if we don't give them the carrot. Heights are an option, but also a cap. John Hall made sure we got height caps in Twinbrook (Station) and we thank him for that.

TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Summary of Written and Verbal Comments Received

Plan Chapter/Topic	Name/Date/Medium	Comment
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Veirs Mill Road	Chris Cox PH 022107	The terms need to be better defined. No three-d imagery. Like to know what development is going to look like. When Twinbrook Metro was being proposed they set up a website so we can understand it. There wasn't that type of imagery available.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Veirs Mill Road	Robert Ostlund, TNPAG member PH 022107	Now we have a leveling of growth. Do we need more condos? Is there a glut? I think mixed use is a great concept but I don't want to lose industrial areas, either inside or outside the city. I think this plan should be delayed because of RORZOR.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Veirs Mill Road	Deborah Schmiel PH 022107	Lack of clear definitions is going to be a temptation to developers to extract maximum profit. Define the zoning before we really decide that this is the plan we want.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Veirs Mill Road	Christina Ginsberg President, TCA PH 022107	<p>Opposed to the Monopole because of the impact it would have on the shopping center for thirty years. Not against development but a plan that recommends a six-fold increase in FAR has to be considered in detail. I don't think people understand what this curb-to-curb development means.</p> <p>Many references to the problem with mixed use and floating zones. RORZOR was invoked because we were hoping to have a more sensible discussion from RORZOR. If RORZOR comes back with floating zones with FARs of six everyone is going to be concerned, not just Twinbrook. Twinbrook does not want to be the community that drops floating zones on the rest of the City; the WINX property started the process for a specific parcel and came out of it something that could be applied all over Rockville.</p>
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Veirs Mill Road	William (Bill) Neil Land Use Chair, TCA PH 101007	Since my earlier comments to the PC in the essay Mixed Use Mania we have been able to evaluate the effects of the downturn in national and local real estate markets. There are many homes for sale, for rent and empty in Twinbrook at the same time we're conducting experiments in smart growth. It will probably take five years to sort out whether there is a problem with the product or the timing.

TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Summary of Written and Verbal Comments Received

Plan Chapter/Topic	Name/Date/Medium	Comment
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Veirs Mill Road	Alison Moser PH 101007	Gratified to see the architects' presentation because once they started doing the planning they saw that the density was too high for Twinbrook Shopping Center. I think 65 feet is too high, too many people. Schools are crowded. Approve Atlantic Avenue cut-through – it would help access and would slow the cars surfing through the parking lot.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Veirs Mill Road	Lora Meisner President BECA TNPAG PH 101007	Including pending projects there are 85 development projects proposed in the City. Too much development going on in Rockville and doubt the density suggested in this plan is sustainable because of the amount of development that precedes it. Many people in the Atlantic Avenue area do not want a cut-through because the traffic is already bad. We need to get more community input from the people directly affected.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Veirs Mill Road	Sherry Lane PH 101007	I think that something has to happen in Twinbrook. The shopping centers are both in decay. Problems with crime, litter, drunkenness. Development might improve those issues. Traffic and pedestrian safety a huge issue too.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Veirs Mill Road	Mary Ann Barnes PH 10107	This Twinbrook Plan and printed brochure seems to focus on the excessive commercial development at the expense of neighborhood character. Who's going to pay for all of this? Both Twinbrook Shopping Centers are in sad condition, dirty windows, and sidewalks in both centers full of gum wads. On the north side sidewalks are dangerous. It slopes.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Veirs Mill Road	Judy Miller VP TCA TNPAG PH 101007	Very firmly felt that 35 feet was probably right at Twinbrook Shopping Center and Mart. Came with some general considerations: commercial on the bottom, professional offices on the top. We would want to keep our local businesses and allow them to prosper.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Veirs Mill Road	Carl Henn PH 101007	The architects who brought these drawings to us have helped me visualize the plan better. I think it helped the process for everyone to see this. The visualization concept drawing process came up with lower density by a substantial margin: 1.25 FAR instead of 2.0. Given the strong concerns about density I think that's the direction to go so.

TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Summary of Written and Verbal Comments Received

Plan Chapter/Topic	Name/Date/Medium	Comment
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Veirs Mill Road	Naomi Belkin, President Twinbrook Park Condo Assn. (Twinbrook Mart) PH 101007	Businessperson who represents the business people here. Agree that the center has always looked lousy, but when the [previous manager] sold I took over and have poured every single dollar into that shopping center trying to get it to look better. Continuing that process, but can't change twenty years of bad management overnight.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Veirs Mill Road	Jacquie Kubin PH 101007	Spend money on outreach to the shopping center owners and fix those areas. We need better infrastructure: pipes are seeping in streets; sidewalks are broken, light pollution. Make the community more beautiful and look at the next five, six years and tomorrow, because twenty years might not come.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Veirs Mill Road	Rich Gottfried, TCA PH 111407	Partner with Montgomery County to increase the Twinbrook Library. On Catalysts 3, 4 and 5: implement a ten year moratorium on all future development for the shopping centers on Veirs Mill Road, Burgundy Estate Shopping Center and the Lewis Avenue industrial area. Implement one-way driving directions at the two Veirs Mill Road shopping centers and repaint the parking spaces to angles to accommodate one-way. Obtain a bank, satellite police station, fire station and satellite medical facility.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Veirs Mill Road	Bill Neil, TCA Land Use Chair PH 111407	I sent more extensive comments in August. Follow up on what [Mr. Gottfried] said. There is a lot of development going on right now. It's a big experiment and it's not selling well. Too early to know if it's the market or that the concept is not as marketable here as in other locations. Let's hear from the property owners. If we implement this now, at the worst possible market time we face the loss of what's functioning pretty well, if not beautifully now. Hard to look out 30 years. Support 10-year moratorium. Support retail with office space on top – mixed use residential a higher risk.

TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Summary of Written and Verbal Comments Received

Plan Chapter/Topic	Name/Date/Medium	Comment
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Veirs Mill Road	Jacquie Kubin Zikowski PH 111407	Something has to be done on Veirs Mill Road. I've almost stopped doing my shopping there. We need some professional uses there: pediatricians, lawyers and services for the neighborhood.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Veirs Mill Road	Kevin Kane PH 111407	General Counsel to the Twinbrook Shopping Center Joint Venture in the 2000 block of Veirs Mill Road – from Safeway to the Library. Realize we're coming in late to this but are very concerned with the area and will be addressing the issue in detail in the near future.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Veirs Mill Road	Karl Harger PH 111407	Need to support businesses at Twinbrook Shopping Center who are giving good service.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Veirs Mill Road	Roberta Lamarr PH 111407	Many people in the community don't have vehicles and rely on the Twinbrook Shopping Center. We don't want the shopping center taken away – people need Safeway and CVS.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Veirs Mill Road	Jack Martinelli Written	Read the Draft Twinbrook Neighborhood Plan with interest. Residents have understandable concerns about what the new zones involve as they are still being explored at the City level. We do not know the consequences. Will the redevelopment design include an above ground community center for teenagers and seniors? Will the Twinbrook Library be upgraded? Will there be landscaped areas? Will there be parking meters? Concerns about traffic congestion and neighborhood safety. When do the Catalysts start? What is the timeframe? Support: commercial recycling program; City Police sub-station in the Veirs Mill Road commercial area.

TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Summary of Written and Verbal Comments Received

Plan Chapter/Topic	Name/Date/Medium	Comment
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Veirs Mill Road	William A Ormsby Written	Lived in Twinbrook almost 30 years, great neighborhood to live in and has improved with various city programs over the years. Multi-use areas should be more defined and spelled out and not give developers an open book.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Veirs Mill Road	Alison Moser Written	Heights at shopping centers along Veirs Mill Road should be less than 65 feet. 35 feet would be more reasonable and would still provide sufficient incentive for the owners to redevelop if they wished.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Veirs Mill Road	Anna M. Colandreo Written	Lived in Rockville for almost 50 years. Raised family in the beautiful neighborhood. Appalled to learn of plan to raze the existing Twinbrook Shopping Center and Twinbrook Mart. Senior citizens need the Safeway, CVS, Dunkin Doughnuts and Post Office and don't want to drive far. Do not agree with allowing 65 foot high condos. If they are affordable housing projects our property values will go down to nothing. Do not agree with rezoning and changing the structure of our family neighborhood.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Veirs Mill Road	Bill Neil Written	Essay "Making Sense of Mixed Use Mania" submitted as formal commentary on the Twinbrook Plan. Mixed-use is a fad. Fear of gentrification: new construction leads to higher rents, driving out local businesses. Real estate in a downturn. Should wait and see how market moves before rezoning any additional areas. Why is there no hardware store?

TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Summary of Written and Verbal Comments Received

Plan Chapter/Topic	Name/Date/Medium	Comment
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Veirs Mill Road	Lora Meisner, Burgundy Estates Civic Association Written	The Twinbrook area is the densest area in the City and doesn't need more density. a) Lower the height at Twinbrook Shopping Center to 35 feet. b) At Twinbrook Shopping Center have two stories with office space and/or more retail on the second floor to serve the community. No apartments or condos. c) Do not cut Atlantic Avenue through to McAuliffe Drive. d) Where is the park at the Twinbrook Shopping Center?
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Veirs Mill Road	Richard Gottfried Written	Implement a ten-year moratorium on all future development of the Veirs Mill Road commercial area, Burgundy Estates Shopping Center and Lewis Avenue industrial area. Improve areas now by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementing one-way driving directions for Veirs Mill Road shopping centers. Repaint parking spaces. Obtain a Bank Build satellite Police Station. Fire Station if necessary. Obtain satellite medical facility.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Veirs Mill Road	Naomi Belkin and others Twinbrook Mart Condominium Assn. Written	Small business and property owners of the Twinbrook Mart Shopping Center. Any substantial change in the zoning height below the current 75-feet would devalue our investment offer little incentive for redevelopment. Aware of community's need for products and services from the Center, but there should be a balanced view of the practical realities. If a height or zone offers no incentive for redevelopment – and limits opportunities - we will be deprived of adequate recompense on our investment. The future must include some modernization. The shopping center is old and difficult to maintain. We pay substantial real estate taxes on the property and feel strongly that we are due some consideration.

TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Summary of Written and Verbal Comments Received

Plan Chapter/Topic	Name/Date/Medium	Comment
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Veirs Mill Road	Naomi Belkin Twinbrook Mart Condominium Assn. Written	<p>Reiterate our objection to any zoning height which reduces current height of 75 feet. Owners discussed potential need to redevelop in the future: like to find a developer who would give the owners back their original square footage at the end of development. Currently know of a group with \$80 million to invest. Shopping Center relatively small – 3.9 acres/55,000 square feet owned retail space. More height is financially attractive to a developer in order to recoup the investment. The small businesses have invested greatly in the property. Unfair of the City to devalue the property through zoning that makes redevelopment impossible. The property is on a major highway and should be given every chance to grow and develop. We pay substantial taxes – devaluation would mean the City is not interested in using this tax money towards improvements in the area. Redevelopment of quality not based on height but on care put into design. We're planning to stay; we have the best interests of the community and ourselves in mind. Reducing the height would deprive the owners of the ability to plan a shopping center that would be a credit and add value to the community.</p>
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Veirs Mill Road	Harvey B. Maisel Manager, Twinbrook Post Office LLC Written	<p>Owner of Twinbrook Mart unit housing the U.S. Post Office. Strongly object to any zoning change reducing height on the site below 75 feet. Because of small size and narrowness of site lowering building height will significantly reduce the feasibility of redevelopment – there is a threshold below which redevelopment does not make economic sense. Support TNP proposal encouraging mixed-use development. A well-designed mixed-use redevelopment on Veirs Mill Road would enhance the streetscape; provide living or workspace on significant transportation routes, with modern neighborhood retail space within walking distance of public transport and residential neighborhoods. We are members of this neighborhood; we pay our taxes and work very hard for the good will of our residential neighbors. We want to be a creative part of the future and want to be on record in support of changing to mixed-use zoning and against any change in building heights.</p>

TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Summary of Written and Verbal Comments Received

Plan Chapter/Topic	Name/Date/Medium	Comment
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Veirs Mill Road	Richard M. Schneible	Reference to the FAQ reference to “King Farm development”. This is mostly high density and multifamily and not in keeping with the single family housing currently in the area. I do not support this type of development.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Burgundy Center		
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Burgundy Center	Lora Meisner, President, BECA, TNPAG member. PH 022107	BECA decided unanimously against rezoning the Burgundy Shopping Center for mixed use, or anything taller than allowed under present C-1 zoning.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Burgundy Center	Jonathan Kapneck Kapneck Management On behalf of owners of Burgundy Park Shopping Center, Baltimore Road Written	Plan should be updated to reflect improvements at the Burgundy Park Shopping Center (referred to in the Plan as the Burgundy Center). The management company has worked with City to address traffic flow issues. Façade has been repainted annually. Grounds maintained on daily basis. Security systems updated.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Burgundy Center	Richard R. Bowers Written	Loitering and littering at Burgundy Center were prevalent 40 years ago and appears to remain today.

TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Summary of Written and Verbal Comments Received

Plan Chapter/Topic	Name/Date/Medium	Comment
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Twinbrook Parkway and Ardennes Avenue		
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Twinbrook Parkway and Ardennes Avenue	Stephen Elmendorf, attorney Linowes & Blocher, speaking on behalf of AvalonBay Communities Inc. PH 022107	AvalonBay Communities Inc. national developer, owner and operator of apartment communities. Owns several communities in Montgomery County, owns 12720 Twinbrook Parkway, where the FDA is currently doing R&D work. The plan calls for this site zoned I-1 to be a transitional buffer between Twinbrook Station and the adjacent single family neighborhood and proposes a mixed use zone that would preserve industrial use and allow some residential. Don't think that is a practical solution. The lease is up in May 2009 and the building will become vacant: it would cost more than \$3.5 million to renovate, not cost-effective. Recommend an amendment to the mixed-use zone that allowing multi-family on that site as a special exception, with all the public input. We have presented these ideas to staff and they have passed them along to the advisory group.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Twinbrook Parkway and Ardennes Avenue	Jonathan Cox, Senior Vice President, AvalonBay Communities PH 022107	Developer of multi-family communities and focus on locations close to Metro, such as Avalon at Grosvenor Station. The site is immediately adjacent to Metro, with access to Twinbrook Parkway at one end and Ardennes Avenue at the other. Concept is to make a transition between high density at Twinbrook Station and the seven stories, 150,000 sq. ft Uniwest building, and the single-family homes on Halpine Road. There is a 50-foot City-owned treed buffer along Halpine Road. Proposing a four-story building with central parking structure, stepping down to three-stories along Halpine Road.

TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Summary of Written and Verbal Comments Received

Plan Chapter/Topic	Name/Date/Medium	Comment
		Understand that the I-1 zone allows daycare centers: we could put a daycare center on the Metro side of the property. The current concept is 240 units, 60 to an acre. Dense for Twinbrook but it's a great transitional use between single-family residential and higher density commercial. The units would be rental, owned by AvalonBay, a New York Stock Exchange publicly traded Real Estate Investment Trust.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Twinbrook Parkway and Ardennes Avenue	Barbara Sears Linowes & Blocher PH 111407	<p>Representing Avalon Bay, owner of 4-acre property at Ardennes Avenue and Twinbrook Parkway, with a 50-foot city-owned treed buffer between the property and Halpine Road. Excellent site for high quality multi-family residential. Currently zoned I-1, improved by office building built in 1967, leased to FDA. Lease expires in May 2009 and FDA will vacate.</p> <p>Interesting mix of uses around the site, commercial, church, residential and commercial across Twinbrook Parkway in the County. Four factors to consider:</p> <p>Twinbrook Station is proceeding. Mixed-use project on 26 acres at Metro – heights 13 to 5 stories. AB 400 yards from the metro platform.</p> <p>Uniwest started construction this fall. 7 stories, 150,000 square feet of office immediately to the south. AB important transition and buffer.</p> <p>Give consideration to separating plan recommendations on Ardennes/Twinbrook Parkway from those on Lewis Avenue – different ownership pattern and site sizes; Lewis backs up to the railroad track.</p> <p>City modifying comprehensive zoning ordinance – the MXTD zone would allow an excellent project that could act as a buffer.</p>
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Twinbrook Parkway and Ardennes Avenue	John Cox Vice President, Avalon Bay Communities PH 111407	Acquired the property two and a half years ago because of its location adjacent to Twinbrook Station, Metro and the road network. The site is 4 acres and the proposed buildings would be between three and four stories wrapped around a four story centralized parking garage that will serve the residents; 240 units. Also street parking at access points and on road through site, utilizing the current curb cuts on Ardennes Avenue and Twinbrook Parkway. Prepared to look at traffic circulation in the area –

TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Summary of Written and Verbal Comments Received

Plan Chapter/Topic	Name/Date/Medium	Comment
		multi-family will have a different impact than office. Prepared a massing study and have made some changes in response to neighborhood concerns: re-oriented the pool on the south side of the property; replaced daycare with greenspace; eliminated another curb cut on Ardennes Avenue. From the single-family homes on Halpine there's a buffer: 40 feet of roadway, 50-foot City-owned wooded buffer, 15-foot minimum set back.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Twinbrook Parkway and Ardennes Avenue	Jacquie Kubin Zikowski PH 111407	We need to look at Avalon Bay and think about it. I'm not happy with mixed-use industrial or light industrial there.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Twinbrook Parkway and Ardennes Avenue	William Kominers Holland & Knight LLP (on behalf of Uniwest Group LLC) Written	Re the 2.1 acre property at Twinbrook Parkway and Ardennes Avenue (the "Uniwest Property"). The TNP recommendations should remain consistent with the currently approved Use Permit for office in both land use and zoning recommendations. Plan should recognize and retain consistency with the Annexation Agreement and the existing Use Permit. Uniwest has completed off-site stream improvements as part of the Use Permit conditions. P. 23 notes that the property cannot be rezoned until the expiration of the five years following annexation. Even after that time the Annexation Agreement will still be in place.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Twinbrook Parkway and Ardennes Avenue	Stephen P. Elmendorf Linowes and Blocher LLP (on behalf of AvalonBay Communities Inc.)	Re: 12720 Twinbrook Parkway (Lot N 23). Ask that a TNP amendment take one of three forms: A recommendation in the TNP that this property, which is currently zoned I-1, be rezoned to a residential zone permitting multi-family dwellings; or A recommendation that the I-1 Zone be amended to permit multi-family dwellings by special exception where recommended by a neighborhood plan, and that the TNP so

TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Summary of Written and Verbal Comments Received

Plan Chapter/Topic	Name/Date/Medium	Comment
	Written	recommend; or A recommendation that the Mixed Use Industrial Zone, proposed by the TNP, include multi-family dwellings as a special exception use where recommended by a neighborhood plan, and that the TNP so recommend.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Twinbrook Parkway and Ardennes Avenue	Barbara A. Sears Linowes and Blocher LLP on behalf of AvalonBay Communities, 12720 Twinbrook Parkway Written	Recommendation that Draft TNP be revised to reflect change to surrounding land uses (construction of Uniwest, Twinbrook Station etc.) TNP should make separate recommendations for the Lewis Avenue and Ardennes/Twinbrook Parkway areas to reflect the differences. Requests Draft TNP be modified to permit residential use proposed by AvalonBay. Suggest RORZOR recommended Mixed Use Transit Development District (MXTD) with limitations on height and density to be outlined in the TNP as the most appropriate zoning category.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Twinbrook Parkway and Ardennes Avenue	Barbara A. Sears Linowes and Blocher LLP on behalf of AvalonBay Communities, 12720 Twinbrook Parkway Written	AvalonBay – impact on circulation on Ardennes Avenue. Will require all residents to exit onto Twinbrook Parkway via the full movement Twinbrook Parkway access – will limit traffic southbound on Ardennes and limit AB resident traffic on residential neighborhood streets. 50-foot buffer – if City permits, AvalonBay has offered to reforest the 50-foot buffer with stronger trees and or have the buffer professionally landscaped. Demographics – in the mid-Atlantic area the average AB resident is between 35-36 years old with an annual income of approximately \$84,000. AB communities in the mid-Atlantic average fewer than 3% school-age children – estimate that AB Twinbrook will generate fewer than 8 children annually. AB will be required to pay the MoCo school improvements impact of \$4127 per non-MPDU unit. AB strictly enforces limit of no more than two people per bedroom. AB currently anticipating an average rent of \$1700 per month. On completion, anticipates individual rents from \$1050/studio to \$2200/two-bedroom unit. AB has committed that 12.5% of its 240, or a minimum of 30 units will be MPDUs.

TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Summary of Written and Verbal Comments Received

Plan Chapter/Topic	Name/Date/Medium	Comment
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Lewis Avenue		
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Lewis Avenue	Judy Miller, VP TCA TNPAG PH 022107	Don't know what the mixed use is and needs definition. RORZOR needs to define it and give some clarification. Let's look carefully at what mixed use will do for our neighborhood; we've got too many condos now. Worried about density and traffic. May be a push for a cut-through to Twinbrook Commons. Do not agree with floating zones.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Lewis Avenue	Judy Miller, VP TCA TNPAG PH 101007	On Lewis Avenue prefer townhouses. Need for families to have places to live. Studios, one and two bedrooms are not helping families. Affordable housing doesn't really work with condos. If there were enough townhouses they'll be MPDUs too. Want a community center on the Taylor property. We've got security concerns there. Not been given a community center by the developers [of Twinbrook Station].
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Lewis Avenue	Robert and Phyllis Taylor. PH 111407	Owners of 5946 Halpine Road. (The Taylor property.) Have been here a long time. It was a rental property for many years and is zoned residential. We want to see that continue. Have sent a letter of testimony to the Planning Commission. Would like any references to our property taken out of the Plan – could negatively impact our business there.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Lewis Avenue	Rich Gottfried, TCA PH 111407	Build a community center on the Taylor property to meet the needs of youth and seniors.

TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Summary of Written and Verbal Comments Received

Plan Chapter/Topic	Name/Date/Medium	Comment
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Lewis Avenue	Catherine L. Coffman L & H Investments Written	The staff and the planning group have been helpful, responsive, organized and professional during this process. Congratulations on the completion of the draft document. We continue to be pleased with the flexibility included for the industrial areas and the awareness of the value of these properties.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Lewis Avenue	Joe McClane, President, Cambridge Walk II HOA and Tracy Pakulneiewicz- Chidiac, President Cambridge Walk I HOA Written	Believe proposed TNP offers right balance between nuanced guidance and practical flexibility that will allow Twinbrook to meet the evolving planning challenges over the next quarter century. Believe Plan's emphasis on revitalizing the commercial and industrial areas of Twinbrook by using floating zones ...and mixed use development will lead to neighborhoods that meet light industrial and commercial needs of neighborhood and add to residential mix by allowing more housing options.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Lewis Avenue	Christina Ginsberg Twinbrook Citizens Association (TCA) Written	All references to floating or overlay zones (except historic designations) should be deleted. Taylor property should be acquired by City for community public use. Recommend against cut through from Lewis Avenue to future Twinbrook Station.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Lewis Avenue	Robert and Phyllis Taylor. Re: 5946 Halpine Road. "The Taylor Property" Written	Request that reference to the property be removed from the Draft Plan. Single family house zoned R-60 is grandfathered into the neighborhood based on its use as a commercial business for many years. Arbitrary and vague recommendation in Draft TNP incorrect and would hinder livelihood, and property does contain viable residence.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: Lewis Avenue	Richard Gottfried Written	Build a community center on the Taylor property for youth and seniors.

TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Summary of Written and Verbal Comments Received

Plan Chapter/Topic	Name/Date/Medium	Comment
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: General		
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: General	Brigitta Mullican PH 101007	Like the optional method, which works - something the city is trying to get rid of. Can negotiate and get more for the community. What can the commercial areas be in twenty years? Talk about the condos in town center: Rio took ten years to sell - now it's booming. Things are different from East Rockville where the business community had a concern. I don't think they have a problem with this plan because the City has reached out to them. If they had a problem they'd come out.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: General	Rich Gottfried, TCA PH 111407	On Catalysts 3, 4 and 5: implement a ten year moratorium on all future development for the shopping centers on Veirs Mill Road, Burgundy Estate Shopping Center and the Lewis Avenue industrial area.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: General	Richard Gottfried Written	Implement a ten-year moratorium on all future development of the Veirs Mill Road commercial area, Burgundy Estates Shopping Center and Lewis Avenue industrial area.
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: General	Stephanie Martins Director, Local Planning Assistance Maryland Department of Planning Written	Your plan provides an excellent blueprint for the actions and programs needed to address the growth and redevelopment related issues confronting this portion of Rockville. The possible use of flexible development tools such as the floating zone and form-based zoning would enable you to create a development scheme that best meets the unique needs of this neighborhood. Congratulations on an excellent planning effort.

TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Summary of Written and Verbal Comments Received

Plan Chapter/Topic	Name/Date/Medium	Comment
Chapter 4 Non-Residential Areas: General	Joan Chiariello Written	Good idea regarding floating zone – especially idea of creating green space and housing units above businesses
Chapter 5 Transportation		
Chapter 5 Transportation	Rich Gottfried PH 022107	The plan does not specifically address proposed changes in traffic patterns: going to eliminate service roads on Veirs Mill Road? Much more work is needed on Chapter 5, Transportation.
Chapter 5 Transportation	Mary Ann Barnes PH 022107	Delighted when Metro came. It was created for safe, efficient mass transportation, not as a real estate holding corporation with a future intent to create large profits for residential and commercial land development. You need to hold some of that land, not build on it.
Chapter 5 Transportation	William (Bill) Neil PH 022107	Need to know how much development is coming and an assurance that traffic will not be made worse by higher densities. Citizens have a right to be fully informed. Need to define the densities in the zones and put numbers on them. Support smart growth, although it's not perfect. Current density of about seven units per acre is double the density that Maryland's smart growth has for priority funding areas. Support a trolley. Who's going to pay for it? How often is it going to run? It's got to be fleshed out.
Chapter 5 Transportation	Corrine Garver PH 022107	Lived on the corner of Veirs Mill and Clagett for four years. Not very familiar with the plan, are here to learn more. Concerned about Veirs Mill Road. Live where the service lane is slightly depressed from Veirs Mill and see accidents weekly. Cars and trucks have come off Veirs Mill and onto the service road and hit my parked car, very dangerous. Don't understand Veirs Mill being a State road that we have no control over.

TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Summary of Written and Verbal Comments Received

Plan Chapter/Topic	Name/Date/Medium	Comment
Chapter 5 Transportation	William (Bill) Neil Land Use Chair TCA PH 101007	The retail component needs urban densities but we'd be stuck in traffic - don't have the transit infrastructure to support urban density. Should leave the commercial areas as they are, revisit them in five years when there is a better sense of the level of demand.
Chapter 5 Transportation	Alison Moser PH 101007	Waiting for a meeting on traffic calming on Twinbrook Parkway. Difficult to cross. Approve of the speed cameras, they've slowed traffic down, but still a lot of cars.
Chapter 5 Transportation	Christina Ginsberg Chair TCA PH 101007	Don't support the bus route or transit line. Don't support the transit center.
Chapter 5 Transportation	Todd Harrison Chair T&T TCA PH 101007	Approve of pedestrian safety measures that are outlined. Should keep them. The neighborhood doesn't want Bus Rapid Transit. The Plan talks about a circulator trolley: it's an outdated idea now that the Council decided not to fund the trolley. Biggest concern is that the plan doesn't talk about traffic impact from adding condos.
Chapter 5 Transportation	Rich Gottfried, TCA PH 111407	Ch. 5 p. 47 – build a road pedestrian bike bridge across the tracks from Thompson Avenue to Wicomico Avenue. Build a trolley railway down the middle of Veirs Mill Road. Design plan to improve Halpine Road, Ardennes Avenue and Twinbrook Parkway now. Build bus shelters at every bus stop. Do Ch. 5 now, not later. Partner with MoCo to have developers pay for infrastructure.
Chapter 5 Transportation	Karl Harger PH 111407	I'm glad that my comments from the last session were recorded. I'm concerned about traffic and the new construction near Paul Drive – new luxury condos will impact traffic on Veirs Mill Road. Don't want Veirs Mill Road widened. New development should be paying a fair share for new infrastructure rather than passing costs on to residents.

TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Summary of Written and Verbal Comments Received

Plan Chapter/Topic	Name/Date/Medium	Comment
Chapter 5 Transportation	Rich Gottfried, TCA Written	Infrastructure not thoroughly planned out with the anticipation of the increase of residents discussed in the plan. No consideration of on/off ramps or traffic circles. Need transportation specialist consultant to see what other cities have done to plan for growth in their neighborhoods and correct existing neighborhood streets and traffic patterns. Veirs Mill Road may need a traffic pattern like the widening of Montrose Road.
Chapter 5 Transportation	Rick Kiegel McCormick Taylor (Consultant Project Manager for the Montgomery County Veirs Mill Road BRT Feasibility Study) Written	Re: the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Study (pages 49, 50) Consult with MDOT to determine status of project. Consult with Montgomery County Council and County Executive to determine their position. Montgomery County DPWT was responsible for the BRT study. Verify use of acronyms.
Chapter 5 Transportation	Marvin Engel Written	(Issues at Carl Sandburg) Cars parked blocking the sidewalk. Community participation in changes at school in bus volume after the fact. Use metro lampposts to ID location on parking lot – checkered board. Tried a dozen years ago.
Chapter 5 Transportation	Joan Chiariello Written	Like idea of circular shuttle services in City of Rockville. Fine with Atlantic Avenue being cut through.
Chapter 5 Transportation	Atul Chojar Written	The roads must be widened so that two cars can travel in opposite directions without one having to stop, even if cars are parked on the curb.
Chapter 5 Transportation	Anna M. Colandreo Written	Traffic so bad that we can't get out of the neighborhood and must wait for the lights at Veirs Mill and Baltimore Roads to change so that we can get where we need to go.
Chapter 5 Transportation	Mrs. Julia Phifer Written	Whenever a residence is added at least one more car will be put onto the adjoining roads. How are the additional vehicles to be accommodated? At certain times, there are already too many cars on the streets.

TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Summary of Written and Verbal Comments Received

Plan Chapter/Topic	Name/Date/Medium	Comment
Chapter 5 Transportation	Christina Ginsberg Twinbrook Citizens Association (TCA) Written	All references supporting a BRT project – on Veirs Mill Road between Rockville and Wheaton – should be deleted. All references supporting a Transit Center at or near the intersection of Veirs Mill Road and Twinbrook Parkway should be deleted.
Chapter 5 Transportation	Rich Gottfried, TCA Written	Implement one-way driving directions for Veirs Mill Road shopping centers. Repaint parking spaces. Build road/pedestrian bridge connecting Thompson Avenue to Wicomico Street over the Metro tracks. Build trolley in middle of Veirs Mill Road instead of the bus lane plan. Improve Halpine Road, Ardennes Avenue and Twinbrook Parkway now. Build bus stops. Partner with Montgomery County to charge developers for infrastructure.
Chapter 5 Transportation	Henrietta V. Gomez, Michael R. Schneible Written	Plan does not address increased traffic if The Forest and Woods Edge were redeveloped into mix use housing types and sizes.
Chapter 6 The Environment		
Chapter 6 The Environment	Christina Ginsberg Twinbrook Citizens Association (TCA) Written	Recommendations to use the property of the Glenview Mansion Civic Center Park and Broome Middle School for storm water management ponds should be deleted.
Chapter 6 The Environment	Lora Meisner, Burgundy Estates Civic Association Written	There is a 5000 tree deficit in the City – we should plant trees and not build. How can the City tout the environment if it covers everything with buildings, asphalt and concrete? Rockville needs time out for 12 – 18 months before we make more development commitments.

TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Summary of Written and Verbal Comments Received

Plan Chapter/Topic	Name/Date/Medium	Comment
Chapter 7 Community Facilities		
Chapter 7 Community Facilities	Carl Henn PH 101007	Plan envisions that we need more park area, green space, in particular in the southern part of Twinbrook. The plan recognizes that we ought to have funding: make the conceptual link between that and money coming from the redevelopment of these mixed use centers. Capture some money for additional pocket parks etc. We could buy burnt out homes, remove an eyesore and provide pocket parks and community gardens.
Chapter 7 Community Facilities	Alison Moser PH 101007	Plan should not support the current uses at the Broome site: there's a methadone clinic next to Meadow Hall Elementary School. The Director there has said that he'd prefer to be Metro accessible. The site is not well kept up.
Chapter 7 Community Facilities	Christina Ginsberg President TCA PH 101007	Don't support taking Glenview Mansion property for storm water runoff that comes from town center.
Chapter 7 Community Facilities	Rich Gottfried, TCA PH 111407	Ch. 1 – Catalyst 2. Millions of dollars are being spent in other parts of the City and Twinbrook would like to have its fair share. These items should be implemented in the FY 2009 budget. Increase Twinbrook Community Center. Partner with Twinbrook Swimming Pool to build an indoor swimming pool. Build a community center on the Taylor property to meet the needs of youth and seniors. Partner with Montgomery County to increase the Twinbrook Library. Senior Center bus should stop at the Library for pick up and drop off.
Chapter 7 Community Facilities	Jack Martinelli Written	City Police sub-station in the Veirs Mill Road commercial area. Immediate preservation and improvement of city open spaces, parks and outdoor public recreation facilities. Does Rockville need a "RockStat"?

TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Summary of Written and Verbal Comments Received

Plan Chapter/Topic	Name/Date/Medium	Comment
Chapter 7 Community Facilities	Richard R. Bowers Written	P. 77 - Montgomery County Fire and Rescue Dept. (MCF&R) cooperates with RVFD. MCF&R provides majority of staffing. City residents should also be aware of the contribution of the Montgomery County Police (MCP).
Chapter 7 Community Facilities	Christina Ginsberg Twinbrook Citizens Association (TCA) Written	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Taylor property should be acquired by City for community public use. • Twinbrook Community Center should be expanded. • Public recreational facilities should be created within the County's Twinbrook Sector area. • Glenview Mansion Civic Center Park should not be included in the "neighborhood" inventory as it is the flagship park for the entire City. Park space per capita rates should be recalculated without Glenview. • Recommendations to use the property of the Glenview Mansion Civic Center Park and Broome Middle School for storm water management ponds should be deleted. • Strengthen language supporting retention and expansion of Twinbrook Library.
Chapter 7 Community Facilities	Rich Gottfried Written	<p>The City should budget \$1.5 million for the following improvements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the Twinbrook Community Center • Partner with Twinbrook Swimming Pool and build an indoor pool. • Build a community center on the Taylor property for youth and seniors. • Partner with Montgomery County to increase the Twinbrook Library.
Chapter 7 Community Facilities	Karl Harger Written	Preserve, or increase, the amount of land dedicated to Parks and Recreation within Twinbrook.

TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Summary of Written and Verbal Comments Received

Plan Chapter/Topic	Name/Date/Medium	Comment
Chapter 7 Community Facilities	Chris Finney Written	Information in Appendix 1, page 92 is incorrect. Twinbrook Forest does not have access to the (former Meadow Hall) pool. Many of us would love our own neighborhood pool, as Veirs Mill Road is too dangerous for children to cross safely.
Chapter 7 Community Facilities	Joe McClane, on behalf of Cambridge Walk II HOA Written	Cambridge Walk II HOA voted unanimously in support of a floating zone for church properties that would allow the City to acquire a present church site for parkland should a church decide to relocate. The Twinbrook Community Church site is a prime example – our immediate area will soon be the most densely populated on the east side of the City, yet it has the least open space. There is little opportunity to acquire open space in our neighborhood without taking existing homes. The most logical and least disruptive solution to the need for future open space is to focus future parkland acquisition on non-residential and non-income producing properties.
Chapter 8 Implementation		
Chapter 8 Implementation	Linda Ekizian, President, East Rockville Civic Association Written	Re: Chapter 8, Implementation. It would be useful to specify all CIP projects that relate to Catalysts 1- 5. If the project(s) scope is not relevant to 1 – 5 it should be listed elsewhere in the Chapter.
Historic Resources		
Historic Resources	Eileen McGuckian, Peerless Rockville PH 022107	Chapter on historic resources is needed on Twinbrook's history, architecture and place in Rockville's total development that moves quickly from the early years into the post-world War II period. It should not be relegated to appendices. Peerless Rockville believes that every Rockville plan should include a chapter on historic resources, listing designated historic districts and identifying resources, such as

TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Summary of Written and Verbal Comments Received

Plan Chapter/Topic	Name/Date/Medium	Comment
		the criteria for designation as a Rockville historic district. (The 18 th century Litton Cemetery in Tweed Park.) The resources in Rockville's recent past survey should be included. We would be happy to work with staff or the advisory group.
Historic Resources	Rich Gottfried PH 111407	Ask Peerless Rockville to review and rewrite Appendices 1, 2 and 3.
Historic Resources	Chris Finney Written	Information in Appendix 1, page 92 is incorrect. Twinbrook Forest does not have access to the (former Meadow Hall) pool. Many of us would love our own neighborhood pool, as Veirs Mill Road is too dangerous for children to cross safely.
Process		
Process	John Tyner, Chair, TNPAG PH 022107	Thank TNPAG for their two-year effort that required dedication to detail and how each element affects the others. Very proud of our process of give-and-take throughout. Important to hear residents view on the plan.
Process	Joseph McClane, President, Cambridge Walk II HOA, TNPAG member. PH 022107	City went out of their way to get an advisory group that reflected every type of housing, community, family. Everything in the plan works someplace: especially pleased with the public realm and industrial and commercial area catalysts. There has been, and will be, ample time for public comment. I think the plan is well thought and want to thank my fellow advisory group members.
Process	Todd Harrison, T&T Chair, TCA. PH 022107	When the plan process started there were 22 people but that dwindled over time. By the end there were only eight members at the meeting, five voted to approve it and three opposed. Need to rewrite parts of the Plan. Should have a core group that will really work the document in a detailed way. The advisory group was a good start.
Process	Rich Gottfried PH 022107	The Twinbrook neighborhood plan needs a lot more work, defining R-60 zoning and mixed-use. Residents propose delaying your decision on the plan and taking at least another year or more to clarify the definitions and hear from residents. Suggest Town Hall meeting coordinated by TCA/BECA. Area very diversified - should be separate tables for the associations and City staff to answer questions about the plan in different languages. There are some aspects of the plan that I support. I can give you a list.

TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Summary of Written and Verbal Comments Received

Plan Chapter/Topic	Name/Date/Medium	Comment
Process	Lora Meisner President, BECA TNPAG Member PH 022107	BECA voted unanimously to postpone finalizing the master plan because they 1) needed more time to consider it and 2) they wanted to see where RORZOR may be heading with zoning changes for the entire City. [In response to a discussion of diversity and community outreach] In the BECA area we have contact with households on each block, and they can talk with their neighbors. Neither you, nor the M&C, are representative of the Rockville community. Lots of people in the Twinbrook area have two or three jobs and families and don't have the time. The record should be kept open. Let the civic associations meet and come forward with proposals for outreach.
Process	Linda Bozzonetti TNPAG Member PH 022107	This process has taken a lot of time. Started with 22 people but was a long process - lost people through attrition. Earlier mention of Veirs Mill Road. It's a State Road - we can make recommendations, but it belongs to the State of Maryland. This plan was not a rubber stamp – not everybody agreed. Had two large community meetings and people made comments. TNPAG reviewed the comments. Should not wait for RORZOR.
Process	Judy Miller, Vice President TCA, TNPAG member PH 022107	Concerns about the interaction of RORZOR and this plan. Need some time to look at it, and more specifics, to have a better understanding and be more comfortable. Want to look again at plan, have more community input, take time to develop a plan that suits our community. We're just TCA - looking to have outreach in our association.
Process	Tracy Pakulniewicz- Chidiac, President, Cambridge Walk I HOA PH 022107	Here as president of the Cambridge Walk I HOA and also to represent myself. Fully support this plan. It's a good, extremely flexible plan, a guideline for the future. In line with development trends in the City. Development is going to happen. TCA, is a good organization, but doesn't fully represent Twinbrook. Their Executive Committee voted on the plan but there are 10,000 people in Twinbrook.
Process	Chris Cox PH 022107	The City probably would get the best results by having a staff member contact the various organizations and make sure everybody has an idea of how to get out to their constituents.

TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Summary of Written and Verbal Comments Received

Plan Chapter/Topic	Name/Date/Medium	Comment
Process	Harry Thomas, former President, TCA PH 022107	I was President (of TCA) when this group was formed, and I'm very proud of them. They did argue and have discussions; maybe some of the M&C should have been there. There should have been more talk. TCA let that down. We could have had another discussion within the community. This is a good plan. We have a lot more time to come back in front of you and the M&C.
Process	Karl Harger PH 022107	What will change? What's the potential impact on my family and me? That's not really clear. You can't beg people. Most are generally indifferent, which is cause for concern. I think there has been a good effort to try and impart some information to people who live in our community but it's never enough.
Process	Robert Ostlund TNPAG Member PH 022107	Member of the TNPAG but after the group dragged on I became disillusioned and began to attend less. Worked with TCA and had 20 people show up. 80 or 100 turn up when something serious happened. But rarely more than 15 or 20. There is a low response from people in our community.
Process	Kevin Harris PH 022107	Thanks to everybody who put hard work into this plan, it's a great first step. But it doesn't answer the question of what Twinbrook is going to look like in 20 years. Plan and RORZOR should put forth specific recommendations supported within the community. Postpone the plan because there is still a lot of work to be done.
Process	Christina Ginsberg President, TCA PH 022107	This process is very important - have been waiting patiently to have our say. This plan has problems and the two citizens associations intend to work together to form a committee, go through this plan line by line and deal with the problems that are inherent. Would like to come back at some future date and give a presentation in detail on what needs to be fixed. Getting three minutes each and are prepared to spend another year talking about what we want, how we want it.
Process	Kenneth Brown PH 022107	First, the plan should address as many of the opinions in the community as possible. It should listen to the people of the community. Second, the plan should satisfy the needs of the community, different from people's desires or wants. Third, the plan should be defined precisely and in detail.

TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Summary of Written and Verbal Comments Received

Plan Chapter/Topic	Name/Date/Medium	Comment
Process	Linda Ekizian President, ERCA PH 022107	Don't live in Twinbrook; live in adjacent community of East Rockville, which adopted its plan in 2004. Was on that advisory committee, and now serve on the Stonestreet Task Force. Imperative plan specific in defining the vision of what areas of Twinbrook redevelop or don't develop. Residents are 98% of the landmass in Twinbrook. Floating zones are not good - allow opportunities for developers that may not be good for the neighborhood. Citizens associations a great mechanism, even if attendance is low.
Process	Irwin Charles Cohen PH 022107	Do not live in Twinbrook but I'm here to talk about the process. Meeting started out talking about whether the PH should go ahead or not. Obviously this hearing could go on for days. Lot of people out in the community who haven't had the opportunity. You have the authority to hold a second PH.
Process	Linda Bozzonetti TNPAG PH 101007	Speaking on behalf of Joe McClane, TNPAG Chair, Submit testimony in support of the draft TNP. The City and TNPAG worked together to ensure that the entire Twinbrook community was part of the process in developing the TNP. Outreach was one of the most extensive and expensive efforts undertaken. The MDP supports the Plan. The Twinbrook community embraced the plan's focus on retaining single-family homes, improving public facilities. The TNP represents the only concrete action to address Twinbrook's future planning needs. From the few residents who do not like a part of the TNP, we can find no agreement on an alternative to the plan we have represented. Remind everyone the drawings we've seen tonight are a concept – an idea of what could happen in the future. We have no control over what the current property owner chooses to do with their properties.
Process	Karl Harger PH 101007	Lot of people in Twinbrook don't have time to participate and are generally indifferent as things change, although there is always some resistance to change and some people feel powerless. I want to focus on less cars, less auto traffic.

TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Summary of Written and Verbal Comments Received

Plan Chapter/Topic	Name/Date/Medium	Comment
Process	Tracy Pakulniewicz Chidiac, President Cambridge Walk HOA I PH 101007	Here to talk on behalf of myself. I support this plan. It's not a perfect plan but it's flexible. People with concerns about the Plan can come out and express them. I applaud those who worked on this plan for over two years. Plan represents the voice of the people. Tremendous amount of outreach. The PC asked an association to provide a supplemental document recommending changes to the Plan. They didn't do that. Changes can't be made unless they're brought forward.
Process	Paula Squire Waterman, TNPAG PH 101007	Worked very hard in the TNPAG to accommodate each other. There were strong opinions. Worked hard to write the Plan. Tried to keep it flexible and said that we would accommodate different opinions - asked them to be written so they could be added. It's very important to remember that option still exists.
Process	Judy Miller, VP TCA, TNPAG PH 101007	These are two Public Hearings and these are the only two times we have to make comments on it. We brought people into the process – maybe 130 people – we all worked very hard, including city staff.
Process	Harry Thomas Former Chair TCA PH 10107	As President of TCA I put forward names for the TNPAG. This is a Plan that needs to go forth. We need to have some type of a tool to go to the landlords and property owners. The buildings are in need of repair, of being revitalized. This is a tool for that.
Process	Christina Ginsberg Chair, TCA PH 101007	The process has been completely disappointing. We've heard the numbers about what this process cost. I was told \$26,000. That is pitiable money. The Stonestreet Implementation Task Force spent \$285,000 on one consultant. Paper I've handed you is a short response. We said in January that we wanted to see what RORZOR came up with. The Executive Committee of TCA prepared this and Judy [Miller] has hit on some of the points. We are going to tie this to RORZOR. We're still continuing the dialogue but the way this process has been conducted is shameful.
Process	Kevin Gallagher TNPAG PH 101007	This document should be tabled and it shouldn't be acted upon until RORZOR is voted and agreed upon and implemented. Floating zones that are lay over zones are undefined in the document. The historic preservation language is less than democratic.

TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Summary of Written and Verbal Comments Received

Plan Chapter/Topic	Name/Date/Medium	Comment
Process	Steve Wilcox Secretary, TCA PH 101007	A plan like this can do a lot of damage. The [TCA] Executive Committee met and complied a bunch of things that they see as wrong with the plan, and you've heard some of them, and you're going to hear more.
Process	Denise Fredericks TNPAG PH 101007	TNPAG are members of the community who spent two years collaboratively and sometimes combatively discussing what we wanted as a community. Proud that one of the ground rules from our first meeting was that if a strong minority opinion was held we wanted to make sure that it was noted. The things foremost in our minds were traffic, pedestrian safety, needs of seniors and children. No senior center on our side, nothing for middle school students. The plan may not be perfect but it's a good plan. Urge Commission to approve it. Thanks to City staff for their patience and time in answering all our questions.
Process	Jacquie Kubin PH 101007	Member of TCA, though not an active member. Applaud the work that any group can do to create a 129-page document. Not against progress. Need to decide as a group, are we a city or are we a suburb? Don't understand the goal of the plan because you can't tell me what we're going to do in twenty years.
Process	Joe McClane Chair, TNPAG PH 111407	Twinbrook is a diverse community of over 10,000 people - difficult to arrive at consensus. Our Advisory Group reflects the wider community and the plan is based on feedback received from the wider community. There were seven TCA members on TNPAG. It's an inclusive forward thinking document; we didn't always go along with the loudest most strident voices, although we understand that the Planning Commission may recommend changes.
Process	Linda Bozzonetti, TNPAG PH 111407	Let's remember that the commercial and industrial areas are just 3% of the neighborhood. Don't disregard whole plan because you don't like one part of it. Decided as a group to retain the neighborhood zoning and character – don't want to hold neighbors back from making improvements. I don't want Veirs Mill Road to be another Rockville Pike – we need to find a compromise that will work for most of us.

TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Summary of Written and Verbal Comments Received

Plan Chapter/Topic	Name/Date/Medium	Comment
Process	Christina Ginsberg President, TCA 111407	The TCA has work within its administrative structure. We're having an Executive Committee meeting on the 27 th and at that time we'll have some comments that will be voted on and submitted to you.
Process	Royce Hanson Chairman Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission Written comments	Understand goals of Twinbrook Neighborhood Plan. Directed MNCPPC staff to continue County-City coordination, with a focus on the following: Creating a bikeway and pedestrian system that improves connections to the Twinbrook Metro Station and the stream valley park system. Establishing a full range of open spaces and amenities that serve the entire Twinbrook area without duplication. Balancing the development with the capacity of the school system and transportation system. Identifying methods to encourage high quality design of public spaces, connections and the overall community.
Process	Stephanie Martins Director, Local Planning Assistance Maryland Department of Planning Written	Your plan provides an excellent blueprint for the actions and programs needed to address the growth and redevelopment related issues confronting this portion of Rockville.
Process	Carol Hannaford Written	Generally support the plan; think the advisory group has worked hard and I respect their work. Thank you for providing the place and the staff to hold a meeting about the Twinbrook Neighborhood Plan. I appreciate these sessions as a way to help me understand just how complex this topic is and I realize that the city could, if it chose to, implement the plan without reaching out to the neighborhood in this way.

TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Summary of Written and Verbal Comments Received

Plan Chapter/Topic	Name/Date/Medium	Comment
Process	Frank Samuelson Written	[To Chairman Johnson] Thank you for your frank comments regarding TCA President Christina Ginsburg. Ms. Ginsburg leads a small but vocal minority of Twinbrook residents. Her primary goal is to delay and stall any plans for Twinbrook. Many have stopped attending TCA meetings due to her constant negativity and her attempts to expel others who disagree with her views. Thank you for your work on the TNP. I recommend you deal directly with the citizens of Twinbrook.
Process	Lora Meisner Burgundy Estates Civic Association Written	I attended two of the three neighborhood meetings and received feedback from neighbors on the third. Overall attendance was very good, especially at Glenview Mansion. From the discussions it was clear that most people favored less density in the commercial areas with commercial on the first floor and professional/commercial offices on the second and third floors. These meetings were a good beginning. Residents' need to see the options on paper - to show what choices are available. We look forward to continuing to dialogue with our neighbors during the summer and into the fall on this very important plan.
Process	Joe McClane Chair, TNPAG Written	Support the Draft Twinbrook Neighborhood Plan. City staff and TNPAG have conducted one of the most extensive and expensive outreach efforts. Maryland Department of Planning applauded the TNP. The Twinbrook community embraced the plan's focus on retaining single-family homes, improving public facilities and creating a better, more people-friendly environment. The TNP represents the only real concrete action taken to address Twinbrook's future planning needs. Those who do not like parts of the plan have offered no alternative.

TWINBROOK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Summary of Written and Verbal Comments Received

Plan Chapter/Topic	Name/Date/Medium	Comment
Process	Joe McClane Chair, TNPAG Written	<p>Twinbrook diverse community of more than 10,000 residents. Tried hard to ensure that Plan meets needs of all the residents – based on feedback heard directly from the community. Balances the needs of families, and older people in the community with focus on accessibility to amenities.</p> <p>Twinbrook’s Neighborhood Plan an inclusive document that focuses on the stated needs of a majority of the residents, not the loudest, most strident voices. It is a forward-looking plan for the next quarter of century that seeks to anticipate and manage change.</p>
Process	Joe McClane Chair, TNPAG Written	<p>Support suggestion of City staff for worksessions devoted to TNP while leaving the record open to January 16, 2008.</p> <p>Commissioner Hill asked to hear from anybody who disagreed with the “vision” of the Plan and/or the Plan itself. No one at the meeting, nor any other TNP-related meeting prior to last week has disagreed with either the vision or the Plan itself.</p> <p>Have worked almost three years on this planning process – majority of comments on plan were received months ago. Leaving record open while Commission goes forward with its work will enable TNP to move forward while allowing comment.</p> <p>A lengthy process discourages citizen involvement in neighborhood planning.</p>